

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

7 TERRANCE E. WILLIAMS,  
8 Plaintiff,  
9 v.  
10 NNCC, *et al.*,  
11 Defendants.  
12

3:21-cv-00287-MMD-CSD

**ORDER**

Re: ECF No. 70

13 Before the court is Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (ECF No. 70). Defendants have responded to  
14 Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 73) and Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 79).  
15

16 In Plaintiff's motion, he claims that Defendants' counsel failed to comply with an order since  
17 the court granted Defendants' "Joinder to Answer Amended Complaint" and requests the court compel  
18 "statements per doc 34 from Sergio Rojas." (ECF No. 70 at 1, 2.)

19 Try as it might, the court simply is unable to understand what Plaintiff is saying in the Motion  
20 and what relief is sought. There is no order that defense counsel has failed to comply with and there  
21 is no pending discovery request Plaintiff can properly seek to compel a response to.  
22

23 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (ECF No. 70) is **DENIED**.

24 DATED: January 9, 2023.

25   
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
27